

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed September 27, 2007. Claims 1-17 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by *Herzi* (U.S. Patent No. 6,484,262) in view of *Hamamoto* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0000913 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

a. Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicant claims:

A component for a computer, the component comprising a firmware element operable to perform a security check to verify the computer is connected to an authorised network, the security check comprising the steps of:

- generating a random number,
- encrypting the random number with a public key of a public/private key pair associated with the network,
- transmitting the encrypted random number to a network device via the network,
- receiving a response comprising a number from the network device, and
- permitting operation of at least a subsystem of the computer if the response is in accordance with the random number,

the step of permitting operation of at least a subsystem of the computer if the response is in accordance with the random number comprises comparing the random number transmitted to the network device with the number in the response and permitting operation if the number in the response matches the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed when the computer is detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Herzi* in view of *Hamamoto* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least

"the step of permitting operation of at least a subsystem of the computer if the response is in accordance with the random number comprises comparing the random number transmitted to the network device with the number in the response and permitting operation if the number in the response matches the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed when the computer is detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check," as emphasized above.

For example, *Herzi* describes that a security measure is implemented "upon every boot of the particular computer system," at regular intervals of time, or "any duration of time as may be established for a given security policy." See col. 4, lines 4-19. As such, *Herzi* fails to disclose that a "security check is performed when the computer is detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check," as recited in claim 1. Further, *Herzi* does not describe the security check of claim 1 in the manner claimed.

Further, *Hamamoto* describes a monitoring device for an automatic teller machine, where a backup power supply is put in use for the monitoring device when the automatic teller machine is powered off. Accordingly, *Hamamoto* does not describe that a security check is performed when a computer is detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check. Rather, *Hamamoto* describes that a backup power supply is used whenever the main power supply is unavailable. Therefore, *Hamamoto* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Herzi* reference.

As a result, *Hamamoto* individually or in combination with *Herzi* does not teach or suggest at least "the step of permitting operation of at least a subsystem of the computer if the response is in accordance with the random number comprises comparing the random number transmitted to the network device with the number in the response and permitting operation if the number in the response matches the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed when the computer is detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check," as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, *Herzi* in view of *Hamamoto* fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 2-9

Because independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 2-9 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 2-9 contain all the features of independent claim 1. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 2-9 should be withdrawn.

c. Claim 10

As provided in independent claim 10, Applicant claims:

A component for a computer, the component comprising a firmware element operable to:

generate a random number to be used in performing a security check to verify the computer is connected to an authorised network,

encrypt the random number with a public key of a public/private key pair associated with an authorised network,

transmit the encrypted random number to a network device via the network,

receive a response comprising a number from the network device,

compare the random number transmitted to the network device with the number in the response, and

permit operation of at least a subsystem of the computer if the number in the response matches the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed when the computer is detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 10 is allowable for at least the reason that *Herzi* in view of *Hamamoto* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least to "permit operation of at least a subsystem of the computer if the number in the response matches the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed when the computer is detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check," as emphasized above.

For example, *Herzi* describes that a security measure is implemented “upon every boot of the particular computer system,” at regular intervals of time, or “any duration of time as may be established for a given security policy.” See col. 4, lines 4-19. As such, *Herzi* fails to disclose to “permit operation of at least a subsystem of the computer if the number in the response matches the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed when the computer is detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check,” as recited in claim 10. Further, *Herzi* does not describe the security check of claim 10 in the manner claimed.

Further, *Hamamoto* describes a monitoring device for an automatic teller machine, where a backup power supply is put in use for the monitoring device when the automatic teller machine is powered off. Accordingly, *Hamamoto* does not describe that a security check is performed when a computer is detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check. Rather, *Hamamoto* describes that a backup power supply is used whenever the main power supply is unavailable. Therefore, *Hamamoto* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Herzi* reference.

As a result, *Hamamoto* individually or in combination with *Herzi* does not teach or suggest at least to “permit operation of at least a subsystem of the computer if the number in the response matches the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed when the computer is detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check,” as recited in claim 10.

For at least these reasons, *Herzi* in view of *Hamamoto* fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 10, and the rejection of claim 10 should be withdrawn.

d. Claim 11

As provided in independent claim 11, Applicant claims:

A BIOS for a computer, the BIOS being operable to perform a security check to verify the computer is connected to an authorised network as part of a boot process, the security check comprising the steps of:

generating a random number,

encrypting the random number with a public key of a public/private key pair associated with the network,
transmitting the encrypted random number to a network device via the network,

receiving a response comprising a number from the network device, and

comparing the random number transmitted to the network device with the number in the response; and

preventing continuation of the boot process if the number in the response does not match the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed in response to the computer being detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 11 is allowable for at least the reason that *Herzi* in view of *Hamamoto* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "preventing continuation of the boot process if the number in the response does not match the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed in response to the computer being detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check," as emphasized above.

For example, *Herzi* describes that a security measure is implemented "upon every boot of the particular computer system," at regular intervals of time, or "any duration of time as may be established for a given security policy." See col. 4, lines 4-19. As such, *Herzi* fails to disclose "preventing continuation of the boot process if the number in the response does not match the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed in response to the computer being detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check," as recited in claim 11. Further, *Herzi* does not describe the security check of claim 11 in the manner claimed.

Further, *Hamamoto* describes a monitoring device for an automatic teller machine, where a backup power supply is put in use for the monitoring device when the automatic teller machine is powered off. Accordingly, *Hamamoto* does not describe that a security check is performed when a computer is detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check. Rather, *Hamamoto* describes that a backup power supply is used whenever the main power supply is unavailable.

Therefore, *Hamamoto* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Herzi* reference. As a result, *Hamamoto* individually or in combination with *Herzi* does not teach or suggest at least “preventing continuation of the boot process if the number in the response does not match the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed in response to the computer being detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check,” as recited in claim 11.

For at least these reasons, *Herzi* in view of *Hamamoto* fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 11, and the rejection of claim 11 should be withdrawn.

e. **Claim 12**

As provided in independent claim 12, Applicant claims:

A computer comprising a firmware element operable to perform a security check to verify the computer is connected to an authorised network, the security check comprising the steps of:

generating a random number,

encrypting the random number with a public key of a public/private key pair associated with the network,

transmitting the encrypted random number to a network device via the network,

receiving a response comprising a number from the network device, and

permitting operation of at least a subsystem of the computer if the response is in accordance with the random number,

the step of permitting operation of at least a subsystem of the computer if the response is in accordance with the random number comprises comparing the random number transmitted to the network device with the number in the response and permitting operation if the number in the response matches the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed in response to the computer being detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 14 is allowable for at least the reason that *Herzi* in view of *Hamamoto* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “the step of permitting operation of at least a subsystem of the computer if the response is in accordance with the random number comprises comparing the random number

transmitted to the network device with the number in the response and permitting operation if the number in the response matches the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed in response to the computer being detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check," as emphasized above.

For example, *Herzi* describes that a security measure is implemented "upon every boot of the particular computer system," at regular intervals of time, or "any duration of time as may be established for a given security policy." See col. 4, lines 4-19. As such, *Herzi* fails to disclose "the step of permitting operation of at least a subsystem of the computer if the response is in accordance with the random number comprises comparing the random number transmitted to the network device with the number in the response and permitting operation if the number in the response matches the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed in response to the computer being detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check," as recited in claim 12. Further, *Herzi* does not describe the security check of claim 12 in the manner claimed.

In addition, *Hamamoto* describes a monitoring device for an automatic teller machine, where a backup power supply is put in use for the monitoring device when the automatic teller machine is powered off. Accordingly, *Hamamoto* does not describe that a security check is performed when a computer is detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check. Rather, *Hamamoto* describes that a backup power supply is used whenever the main power supply is unavailable. Therefore, *Hamamoto* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Herzi* reference.

As a result, *Hamamoto* individually or in combination with *Herzi* does not teach or suggest at least "the step of permitting operation of at least a subsystem of the computer if the response is in accordance with the random number comprises comparing the random number transmitted to the network device with the number in the response and permitting operation if the number in the response matches the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed in response to the computer being detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check," as recited in claim 12.

For at least these reasons, *Herzi* in view of *Hamamoto* fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 12, and the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

f. **Claims 13-16**

Because independent claim 12 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 13-16 (which depend from independent claim 12) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 13-16 contain all the features of independent claim 12. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 13-16 should be withdrawn.

g. **Claim 17**

As provided in independent claim 17, Applicant claims:

In combination, a computer comprising an element operable to perform a security check to verify the computer is connected to an authorised network and a network device operable to receive a network enquiry from the computer over a network, the element being operable to:

- generate a random number,
- encrypt the random number with a public key of a public/private key pair associated with the network, and
- transmit the encrypted random number to the network device via the network,

- the network device being operable to:
 - receive the encrypted random number from the computer,
 - decrypt the encrypted random number using the private key of the public-private key pair, and

- generate a response comprising the random number and transmit the response to the computer;

- the element being operable to:
 - receive the response comprising from the network device,
 - compare the random number transmitted to the network device with the number in the response, and

permit operation of at least a subsystem of the computer if the number in the response matches the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed in response to the computer being detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 17 is allowable for at least the reason that *Herzi* in view of *Hamamoto* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least to "permit operation of at least a subsystem of the computer if the number in the response matches the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed in response to the computer being detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check," as recited and emphasized above in claim 17.

For example, *Herzi* describes that a security measure is implemented "upon every boot of the particular computer system," at regular intervals of time, or "any duration of time as may be established for a given security policy." See col. 4, lines 4-19. As such, *Herzi* fails to disclose to "permit operation of at least a subsystem of the computer if the number in the response matches the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed in response to the computer being detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check," as recited in claim 17. Further, *Herzi* does not describe the security check of claim 17 in the manner claimed.

In addition, *Hamamoto* describes a monitoring device for an automatic teller machine, where a backup power supply is put in use for the monitoring device when the automatic teller machine is powered off. Accordingly, *Hamamoto* does not describe that a security check is performed when a computer is detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check. Rather, *Hamamoto* describes that a backup power supply is used whenever the main power supply is unavailable. Therefore, *Hamamoto* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Herzi* reference.

As a result, *Hamamoto* individually or in combination with *Herzi* does not teach or suggest at least to "permit operation of at least a subsystem of the computer if the number in the response matches the random number transmitted to the network device, wherein the security check is performed in response to the computer being detected to have been in an unpowered state since a previous security check," as recited in claim 17.

For at least these reasons, *Herzi* in view of *Hamamoto* fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 17, and the rejection of claim 17 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283